Claims 1-32 were presented for examination and were pending in this application.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-18, 20-25 and 27-29 are amended herein.

Claims 2, 7, 11-13, 26, 30 and 32 are cancelled.

Claims 33-51 are newly introduced.

In a Final Office Action dated January 22, 2007, claims 1-32 were rejected.   In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e)

In the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-6, 8, 14-18, 20-25 and 27 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Holt et al. (US 6,601, 061 B1). This rejection is traversed.

As amended, claims 1 and 24 respectively recite a method and program code for providing combined search results on a client device comprising:

> generating and storing in a memory of the client device a local index of articles
>> associated with at least one of a user or the client device, each article having
>> an article type from a plurality of article types;
> executing on the client device a search query on the local index to produce a first
>> result set of articles relevant to the search query;
> receiving on the client device from a remote search system a second result set from a
>> search of a global index, the second result set relevant to the search query;
> generating on the client device a user interface based on user selection of article types
>> to be displayed, the user interface including a combined display of the first
>> result set and the second result set; and
> displaying the first and second result sets to the user in the generated user interface of
>> the client device.

Claim 1 and 24 describe methods and program code that provides combined search results from multiple searches. A local index representing different types of articles are stored in the memory of a client device, for example the user's personal computer, cell phone, or the like. This local index is searched in conjunction with global searches on a remote search system (e.g., a remotely hosted search engine such as Google™) to create first and second result sets. A user interface based on the article types selected to be displayed is then generated on the client device that combines the search results.

Holt does not disclose or suggest these features. Holt discloses a method for using special purpose search results to augment searches for data. Special purpose search resources such as government or university websites provide private search capabilities on information local to the resource. In Holt, searches are sent to a general purpose global search engine and special purpose resources to create first and second result sets. Holt discloses merging result sets from the general and special purpose resources to create a set of results.

In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that "special purpose search resource" reads on a "search query on a local index". As amended, claim 1 recites "generating and storing in a memory of the client device a local index of articles". As is apparent from Holt's Figures, Holt has a "search server 102" that is remote from the clients, 100, 106 and 108, and which communicates with them over the network 104 (FIG 1; 3:21-67). It is this remote search server 102 that has access to the "special purpose search resources," such as "search engines provided by universities, government websites, or the like" (4:46-50). Given that the special purpose search resources are at such government or university websites, it is apparent that Holt fails to disclose "generating and storing in a

14

memory of the client device a local index of articles associated with at least one of a user or the client device" as claimed.

The Examiner further asserts that content local to an individual site such as a special purpose search resource corresponds to content local to a user initiating a search query. This is incorrect. Special purpose resources such as government or university websites are obviously hosted on remote websites, and therefore are not local to the client device of a user generating a search query.

As amended, claim 1 recites "generating on the client device a user interface". In the Final Office action, the Examiner asserts col. 10, 48-57 of Holt discloses user interface generation. This cited portion of Holt discloses network interfaces in the context of computing device operation and fails to disclose user interface generation with a combined display of first and second result sets. As those of skill in the art understand, network interfaces are entirely different from and unrelated to user interfaces.

As shown above, Holt fails to teach or disclose elements within claims 1 and 24. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 24 and all dependant claims of 1 and 24 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

Claim 18 recites similar elements regarding user interface generation and generating a plurality of indices based on article type. For the reasons listed above with respect to claims 1 and 24, Applicants submit that independent claim 18 and dependant claims 19-23 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

15

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 9-10 and 28-29 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Holt in view of Reisman et al. (US 6,611, 862 B2). This rejection is traversed.

Reisman discloses a method for operating a user station configured for communications with a multiplicity of independently-operated data sources. Claims 9-10 and 28-29 depend from claims 1 and 24, which were shown above to be patentably distinguishable over Holt.

Reisman does not remedy the deficiencies of Holt. Specifically, Reisman only discloses the transport of content and fails to disclose elements for searching indices and displaying search results, as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit claims 9-10 and 28-29 to be patentability distinguishable over Holt and Reisman.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-51, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
David Marmaros, et al.

Date: March 22, 2007

By: /Robert R. Sachs/

Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120
Attorney for Applicants

16

Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2410
Fax: (415) 281-1350